UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,242	09/28/2001	Bertram Geck	2001 P 18013 US	6613

7590 06/28/2006

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER	
LEE, JOHN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2618	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/967,242	GECK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOHN J. LEE	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 April 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 28, and 29 are objected to because of the following informalities: the limitation "and/or" is indefinite because it is not clear what is claimed. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-7 and 9-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson et al. (US Patent number 6,230,017) in view of Koo et al. (US Patent number 6,889,040).

Regarding **claim 1**, Andersson discloses that a system (Fig. 1) for restricting features (restriction information) in a wireless network (Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 26 – 67). Andersson teaches that at least one base station (the wireless network includes plurality base stations as see 50 in Fig. 1), each base station operative in communicating an incoming communication directed to, and an outgoing communication originated by, each wireless terminal (MS in Fig. 1) located within a given range (within cell range) of said each base station (50 in Fig. 1) (Fig. 1, column 4, lines 5 – 47, and column 2, lines 26 – 67, where teaches a plurality of base stations, each base station is communicating with mobile stations, each mobile station, and having directing incoming communication

and originating outgoing communication by mobile station located within a boundary of the cell coverage region). Andersson teaches that a base station rules database (the base station rules in location register) comprising representations of rules for restriction on features (informing the rules for restriction information from the location register to mobile terminal) of said each wireless terminal (MS in Fig. 1) wirelessly connected (Fig. 1) to said each base station (50 in Fig. 1) (Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 48 – column 5, lines 60, where teaches the location register, rules database, for each base station informs the rules for restriction on features, information, of each mobile station wirelessly connected to each base station), wherein the restriction for at least one said each wireless terminal (MS in Fig. 1) is dependent on a specific corresponding said base station (50 in Fig. 1) (Fig. 1, 2, column 6, lines 63 – column 7, lines 60, where teaches each base station wirelessly communicates with mobile stations within predetermined coverage area, moreover, the geographical restriction is time dependent, a flag is set in restriction control field to indicate that operation of mobile station is restricted to cells listed in field during the times listed in field). Andersson teaches that the each base station rules database (location register) is accessed in response to an incoming communication directed (wireless downlink communication signal) to a wirelessly connected said each wireless terminal (MS in Fig. 1) located within a given range (given coverage region, within cell region/area in Fig. 1) of said specific corresponding base station (50 in Fig. 1) (column 9, lines 1 – column 10, lines 50 and Fig. 1, 3, where teaches the base station rules database is accessed in response to incoming communication directly connected with wireless for each mobile station located within a cell coverage area of particular

cell), **or** in response to an outgoing communication (wireless uplink communication) originated by said wirelessly connected each wireless terminal located within said given range of said specific corresponding base station (column 9, lines 1 – column 10, lines 50 and Fig. 1, 3, where teaches the base station rules database is accessed in response to outgoing communication directly connected with wireless for each mobile station located within a cell coverage area of particular cell).

Andersson does not exactly disclose the limitation "restricting for mobile unit features". However, Koo discloses the limitation "restricting for mobile unit features" (column 2, lines 6 – 60 and Fig. 1, 2, where teaches base station transmitted restriction for mobile features to mobile station). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Andersson system as taught by Koo, provide the motivation to enhance identifying restriction for mobile service within geographic coverage area for achieving convenient user service in mobile communication system.

Regarding **claim 2**, Andersson discloses that the restriction on features depends at least on the time of day (Fig. 1, 2 and column 7, lines 8 – column 8, lines 17, where teaches the geographical restriction is time dependent).

Regarding **claim 3**, Andersson discloses that the restriction on features depends at least on the priority of said each wireless terminal (Fig. 1, 4 and column 10, lines 55 – column 11, lines 21, where teaches the restriction depends on the priority of said each wireless terminal).

Regarding **claim 4**, Andersson discloses that the restriction on features depends at least on whether a communication is incoming or outgoing (Fig. 1, 2 and column 7, lines 52 – column 8, lines 56, where teaches the restriction control depends on call origination and call reception).

Regarding **claim 5**, Andersson discloses that the restriction on features depends at least on whether a communication is designated as an emergency (Fig. 1, 2 and column 9, lines 25 – 67, where teaches depends on emergency call).

Regarding **claim 6**, Andersson discloses that at least one wirelessly connected wireless terminal is a wireless telephone (Fig. 1, 2 and column 7, lines 52 – column 8, lines 56, where teaches the mobile terminal is wireless telephone call).

Regarding **claim 7**, Andersson discloses that a restriction on features is that a corresponding terminal may not ring (Fig. 1, 2 and column 10, lines 12 – 50, where teaches the mobile station applies the service (display only) by notification for restriction).

Regarding **claim 9**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1. Furthermore, Andersson further discloses that determining which one of a plurality of terminals (MS in Fig. 1) is associated with an incoming communication, and whether the one of a plurality of terminals (MS in Fig. 1) is connected to a base station (50 in Fig. 1) that is selectively operative in communicating incoming communications directed to the one of a plurality of terminals (Fig. 1, 4, column 2, lines 25 – 67, and column 11, lines 22 - 67, where teaches a base station communicates with mobile station and having directing incoming communication by wirelessly, and as the base station

receives a incoming call, the base station identifies and determines the mobile station for restriction control or not by incorporating database). Andersson teaches that accessing, in response to the incoming communication and in the service of the one of a plurality of terminals being connected to said base station (Fig. 1, 4 and column 10, lines 13 – column 11, lines 67, where teaches if the base station checks the mobile station from the database as incoming call processing, the mobile station connects to base station that a service being provided), at least one database (home register) to look up rules governing restriction on the base station connected to the one of a plurality of terminals (Fig. 1, 4 and column 10, lines 13 – column 11, lines 67, where teaches the database to checks the rules restriction on the base station for connecting to the mobile station), the restriction on the base station being independent of the specific identity of the one of a plurality of terminals (Fig. 1, 4 and column 10, lines 13 – column 11, lines 67, where teaches the geographical restriction on the base station is not affected of the operation of the mobile station). Andersson teaches that activating the one of a plurality of terminals if allowed, wherein the allowance depends at least on the restriction on the base station (column 10, lines 13 – column 11, lines 67, where teaches determining to allow the terminal for restriction, activates the restriction on the base station).

Regarding **claim 10**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding **claim 11**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9. Furthermore, Andersson further discloses that the allowance does not depend on the location of the at least one terminal (Fig. 1, 4 and column 10, lines 13 –

column 11, lines 67, where teaches the geographical restriction on the base station is not affected of the operation of the mobile station).

Regarding **claim 12**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 5.

Regarding **claim 13**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 2.

Regarding **claim 14**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9. Furthermore, Andersson further discloses that the allowance on features depends at least on the format of communication (Fig. 2 and column 7, lines 20 – 50, where teaches a record generally formatted in accordance with agreement).

Regarding **claim 15**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 6.

Regarding **claim 16**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 7.

Regarding **claim 17** Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding **claim 18**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding **claim 19**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9. Furthermore, Andersson further discloses that the allowance on features depends at least on whether the terminal is inside a predetermined room (predetermined area, such that hospital or airport) (Fig. 1 and column 9, lines 25 - 67).

Regarding **claim 20**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 9 and 12.

Regarding **claim 21**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 9 and 13.

Regarding **claim 22**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 9 and 14.

Regarding **claim 23**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 9 and 15.

Regarding **claim 24**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 9 and 11.

Regarding **claim 25**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 9 and 11.

Regarding **claim 26**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding **claim 27**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding **claim 28**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding **claim 29**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding **claim 30**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding **claim 31**, Andersson and Koo disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 9.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ranta (US 6,832,093) discloses Method and System for Restricting the Operation of a Radio Device Within a Certain Area.

Pitcher et al. (US 6,947,405) discloses Cellular System with Cybercells.

"Information regarding...Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system... at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)."

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
Or P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313

or faxed (571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: (703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to USPTO Headquarters, Alexandria, VA.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **John J. Lee** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7880**.

He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 8:30am-5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Edward Urban**, can be reached on **(571) 272-7899**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

J.L
June 19, 2006

John J Lee

EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600